

U.S. Department of the Interior

Bureau of Land Management

Lakeview Resource Area Lakeview District Office 1301 South G Street Lakeview, Oregon 97630

November 2003



Lakeview Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision

(Main Text and Appendices)



Cover Photo by Terry Spivey As the Nation's principal conservation agency, the Department of the Interior has responsibility for most of our nationally owned public lands and natural resources. This includes fostering the wisest use of our land and water resources, protecting our fish and wildlife, preserving the environmental and cultural values of our national parks and historic places, and providing for the enjoyment of life through outdoor recreation. The Department assesses our energy and mineral resources and works to assure that their development is in the best interest of all our people. The Department also has a major responsibility for American Indian reservation communities and for people who live in Island Territories under U.S. Administration. BLM/OR/WA/PL-03/026-1793



In Reply Refer To: 1617 (015)

United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT Lakeview District Office 1301 South G Street Lakeview, Oregon 97630

Dear Interested Party:

In accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared the attached Lakeview Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Record of Decision (ROD) for the Proposed Resource Management Plan (RMP)/Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for your review. The Lakeview RMP integrates all resource management activities in the Lakeview Resource Area into a single, unified land use plan that will replace all or portions of three existing land use plans and three plan amendments addressing the management of about 3.2 million acres of public land in Lake and Harney Counties, Oregon.

The ROD was prepared in accordance with 40 CFR Part 1505.2, which requires a concise document linking the final decision to the analysis presented in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Minor differences or points of clarification have been incorporated in response to public comments, further staff review, and changes in national policy.

A 30-day protest period was provided on the land use plan decisions contained in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS in accordance with 43 CFR Part 1610.5-2. In addition, the Governor of Oregon was provided a formal, 60-day review period to determine if the proposed plan conformed to existing state plans. Fifteen protest letters and three comment letters were received. Nine of the protests were determined to represent valid protests. After careful consideration of all points raised in those protests, the BLM Director concluded that the responsible planning team and decision-makers followed all applicable laws, regulations, policies, and pertinent resource considerations in developing the proposed plan. All protesting parties received a response addressing their concerns from the BLM Director. In addition, those who provided comment letters received a response from the BLM Lakeview District Manager addressing their concerns.

The attached ROD serves as the final decision for the land use plan decisions described in the attached RMP and becomes effective on the date the ROD is signed. No further administrative remedies are available at this time for these land use plan decisions (see Table R-1). Please note that some of these planning decisions will require the preparation of detailed, project-level NEPA analyses prior to on-the-ground implementation (see Table R-3). Future public involvement opportunities (including further protest or appeal opportunities) may be provided at that time.

Other decisions have been addressed to a sufficient level of detail in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS process to be implemented over time without further NEPA analysis. These are considered to be new "implementation decisions" (see Table R-4). These will be implemented as funding and staff are available. A separate appeal opportunity for these selected decisions is being provided at this time. The appeal period will close 30 days from the date the Notice of Availability of the ROD/RMP appears in the *Federal Register*. This date will also be announced via local news releases, legal notices, and/or individual postcard mailings. Please review the ROD carefully for a more detailed discussion of the appeal process.

Additional hard copies of all of the related planning documents, including the RMP/ROD may be obtained at the address above. Electronic copies of the documents and all of the associated digital data used in this planning effort may also be obtained via the internet at http://www.or.blm.gov/Lakeview/Planning/planning.htm or on CD-ROM.

We appreciate your help in this planning effort and look forward to your continued participation as the plan is implemented. For additional information or clarification regarding the attached document or the planning process, please contact Paul Whitman at (541) 947-6110 or e-mail at pwhitman@or.blm.gov.

Sincerely,

Thomas E. Rasmussen, Manager

Thomas E. Hormisan

Lakeview Resource Area

Enclosure: (as stated)

Table of Contents

Record of Decision

Introduction	1
What the Decision Will Provide	
What the Decision Will Not Provide	1
Land Use Plan Decisions	
Continuity of Previous Decisions	
Implementation Decisions	
Appeal Procedures for Implementation Decisions	
Overview of the Alternatives	
Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis	
Alternatives Analyzed in Detail	
General Management Themes of the Alternatives	
Environmental Preferability of the Alternatives	
Management Considerations	
Rationale for the Decision	
Mitigation Measures	
Plan Monitoring	
Public Involvement in the Planning Process	
Scoping	
Subbasin Review	
Analysis of the Management Situation	
Draft RMP/EIS	
Proposed RMP/Final EIS	
Consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	
Tribal Participation	
RMP Implementation	
Manager's Recommendations	
State Director Approval	
5 mile 2 220002 1 App 20 (miles	
Resource Management Plan	
Introduction and Background	17
Purpose and Need for the Plan	17
Planning Area	17
Planning Process	17
Planning Issues	18
Issues Eliminated from Detailed Study	21
Planning Criteria	21
Relationship to Federal, State, Local, and Tribal Government Plans	
Desired Range of Conditions	23
Land Use Plan Goals	
Other Strategies	
Management Decisions	
Plant Communities — Shrub Steppe	
Plant Communities — Riparian and Wetland	
Plant Communities — Forest and Woodlands	
Special Status Plants	

Noxious Weeds and Competing Undesirable Vegetation	37
Soils and Microbiotic Crusts	
Water Resources/Watershed Health	39
Fish and Aquatic Habitat	43
Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat	
Special Status Animal Species	51
Livestock Grazing Management	
Wild Horses	55
Special Management Areas — Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and Rese	earch
Natural Areas	57
Special Management Areas — Wilderness	70
Special Management Areas — Wild and Scenic Rivers	73
Special Management Areas — Significant Caves	74
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	74
Human Uses and Values	79
Air Quality	80
Fire Management	81
Recreation Resources	83
Off-Highway Vehicles	86
Visual Resources	88
Energy and Mineral Resources	88
Lands and Realty	92
Roads and Transportation	95
Hazardous Materials	
Operation and Maintenance Actions	
Plan Implementation Process	100
Literature Cited	103
Glossary	109
Giossal y	107
Appendices	
Introduction	A-1
Appendix D: Best Management Practices	A-2
Appendix E: Livestock Grazing	A-8
Appendix E1: Allotment Management Summaries	A-8
Appendix E3: Range Projects	A-142
Appendix E5: Grazing Systems within the Planning Area	
Appendix F: Watershed and Water Quality	A-149
Appendix F2: Riparian/Wetland Areas	A-149
Appendix F3: Water Quality Restoration Plans	A-156
Appendix G: Noxious Weeds	A-165
Appendix L: Fire Rehabilitation	
Appendix L1: Lakeview Resource Area Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan	A-167
Appendix L2: Normal Emergency Fire Rehabilitation Guidelines for	
Wilderness Study Areas	A-169
Appendix N: Minerals	
Appendix N3: Stipulations and Guidelines for Mineral Operations	
Attachment 1 - Locatable Mineral Surface Management	A-176

Attachment 2 - Guidelines for Development of Salable Minerals	
Appendix O: Lands	
Appendix O1: Land Tenure Adjustment Criteria and Legal Requirements	
Appendix O2: Public Lands Available for Disposal	83
List of Tables (Record of Decision)	
Table R-1: Summary of land use allocations	
Table R-2: Existing decisions carried forward and not subject to further administrative remedies	
Table R-3: Future actions likely requiring further NEPA analysis prior to implementation	
Table R-4: New implementation decisions now subject to appeal	16
List of Tables (Main Text)	
Table 1: Land ownership/administration by county within the Lakeview Resource Area	18
Table 2: Steps in the BLM planning process	19
Table 3: Monitoring method by fish and aquatic habitat objective	
Table 4: 1998 State of Oregon water quality impaired stream reaches on LRA-administered lands	33
Table 5: Forage allocation and allotment summary	46
Table 6: Areas unallotted or excluded from livestock grazing	54
Table 7: Characteristics representative to each wild horse herd	54
Table 8: Management summary for ACEC/RNA's	58
Table 9: Overlap of ACEC's and WSA's	59
Table 10: Miles of roads to be closed in special management areas	60
Table 11: Wilderness study areas and instant study areas	72
Table 12: Off-highway vehicle designations by area	76
Table 13: Areas of rights-of-way exclusion and avoidance areas	95
Table 14: Existing withdrawals	96
List of Tables (Appendices)	
Table E3-1: Potential projects by allotment	A-143
Table E5-1: Grazing seasons in relation to months	A-146
Table F2-1: Riparian trend analysis worksheet by category	A-150
Table F2-2: Standards for rangeland health and relationship to watershed	
condition factors (Table F2-1) contributing to nonpoint source pollution	A-154
Table F3-1: 1998 State of Oregon water quality impaired	
stream reaches on LRA-administered lands	A-157
Table F3-2: Watershed conditions and relationship to nonpoint source pollution	A-158
Table F3-3: Management actions that are directly related to or emphasize standards	
for rangeland health and watershed conditions that affect water quality	A-160
Table L2-1: Emergency fire rehabilitation native seed mixtures	
Table O2-1: Public lands available for disposal	

List of Maps (Map Packet)

I-1: Land Status FM-5: Fire Management Plan G-3: **Grazing Allotments** Land Tenure Zones L-5: Right-of-Way Avoidance and Exclusion Areas L-8: R-3: Recreation Opportunity Spectrum Off-Highway Vehicle Designations R-7: Recreation, Wilderness Study Areas, and Wild and Scenic Rivers R-9: Salable Mineral Restrictions M-8: Leasable Mineral Restrictions M-9: M-10: Locatable Mineral Restrictions Special Management Areas SMA-4: SMA-5: Devil's Garden ACEC and WSA Lake Abert ACEC, Abert Rim WSA, and Abert Rim ACEC SMA-7: SMA-9: Lost Forest -Sand Dunes - Fossil Lake ACEC, Sand Dunes WSA, and Lost Forest RNA SMA-9A: Off-Highway Vehicle Designations in Lost Forest-Sand Dunes-Fossil Lake Area SMA-10: Warner Wetlands ACEC SMA-11: Black Hills ACEC/RNA SMA-12: Connley Hills ACEC/RNA SMA-13: Fish Creek Rim ACEC/RNA and WSA SMA-14: Foley Lake ACEC/RNA SMA-15: Hawksie-Walksie ACEC/RNA and Hawk Mountain WSA SMA-16: High Lakes ACEC, Sink Lakes, and Guano Creek ACEC/RNA, and Guano Creek WSA SMA-17: Juniper Mountain ACEC/RNA SMA-18: Rahilly-Gravelly ACEC/RNA SMA-19: Red Knoll ACEC/RNA SMA-20: Spanish Lake ACEC/RNA SMA-21: Table Rock ACEC/RNA SMA-22: Twelvemile Creek Suitable Wild and Scenic River SMA-24: Cabin Lake/Silver Lake Deer Winter Range Cooperative Seasonal Vehicle Closure Area SMA -25: Crane Mountain and Westside Cemetery Vehicle Closure Areas SMA- 26: Squaw Ridge WSA SMA- 27: Four Craters WSA SMA-28: Diablo Mountain WSA SMA-29: Spaulding WSA SMA-30: Orejana Canyon WSA SMA-31: Basque Hills and Rincon WSAs

V-3:

VRM-3:

Juniper Habitats and Treatment Areas

Visual Resource Management Classes

Abbreviations and Acronyms

Reader note: Refer to the list below for abbreviations or acronyms that may be used in this document.

ACEC ~ area of critical environmental concern

APHIS ~ Agricultural Plant and Animal Health Inspection Service

AUM ~ animal unit month

BIA ~ Bureau of Indian Affairs

BLM ~ Bureau of Land Management

BMP ~ best management practice

BOR ~ Bureau of Reclamation

CAA ~ "Clean Air Act"

CFR ~ "Code of Federal Regulations"

CWA ~ "Clean Water Act"

DLCD ~ Department of Land Conservation and Development

DOD ~ Department of Defense

DOE ~ Department of Energy

DOI ~ Department of the Interior

EIS ~ environmental impact statement

EPA ~ Environmental Protection Agency

FAA ~ Federal Aviation Administration

FERC ~ Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

FLPMA ~ "Federal Land Policy and Management Act"

HAZMAT ~ hazardous materials

ICBEMP ~ Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project

IMP (wilderness) ~ "Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review" 1995

ISA ~ instant study area

LCDC ~ Land Conservation and Development Commission

LRA ~ Lakeview Resource Area

NCA ~ national conservation area

NEPA ~ "National Environmental Policy Act"

NRHP ~ National Register of Historic Places

NOAA ~ National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration

NPS ~ National Park Service

ODA ~ Oregon Department of Agriculture

ODEQ ~ Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

ODF ~ Oregon Department of Forestry

ODFW ~ Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

ODOT ~ Oregon Department of Transportation

OHV ~ off-highway vehicle

ONHP ~ Oregon Natural Heritage Program

PRIA ~ "Public Rangelands Improvement Act"

RMP ~ resource management plan

RNA ~ research natural area

SMA ~ special management area

TNC ~ The Nature Conservancy

USDA ~ U.S. Department of Agriculture

USDI ~ U.S. Department of the Interior

USFS ~ U.S. Forest Service

USFWS ~ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

USGS ~ U.S. Geological Survey

VRM ~ visual resource management

WSA ~ wilderness study area

WSR ~ wild and scenic river

Record of Decision —

Introduction

The planning area covers about 3.2 million acres of BLM-administered surface lands and about 3.0 million acres of subsurface mineral estate in Lake and Harney Counties, Oregon (Map I-1). The planning area includes all of the Lakeview Resource Area (LRA) except for approximately 31,500 acres administered by the Burns District and addressed in the Three Rivers Resource Management Plan (RMP) (USDI-BLM 1989d). In addition, the planning area includes approximately 2,172 acres in the Surprise Field Office in northern California and Nevada that the LRA manages under a cooperative agreement.

The primary decision is to approve the attached Lakeview RMP. This Record of Decision (ROD) covers a variety of management actions that are considered to be implementation decisions rather than land use planning decisions. Therefore, this decision has been separated into those actions which are land use planning decisions, which were protestable under the land use planning regulations (43 CFR 1610) and those actions which are implementation decisions, and are currently appealable under the Department of Interior's appeal regulations (43 CFR 4).

What the Decision Will Provide

This ROD will provide overall direction for management of all resources on BLM-administered land in the planning area.

What the Decision Will Not Provide

Many decisions are not appropriate at this level of planning and will not be included in this ROD. Examples of these types of decisions include:

- 1) Statutory requirements. The decision will not change the BLM's responsibility to comply with applicable laws and regulations including the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, National Environmental Policy Act, Federal Land Policy and Management Act, or any other federal law.
- 2) *National Policy*. The decision will not change BLM's obligation to conform with current or future national policy.

- 3) Funding levels and allocations. These are determined annually at the national level and are beyond the control of the field office.
- 4) Management changes proposed for lands outside of Oregon. Recommended management changes for the 2,172 acres in the Surprise Field Office in northern California and Nevada will be provided to the California State Director of the BLM for consideration. The California State Director will have the final jurisdiction over these lands and may choose to adopt them through subsequent land use planning efforts for other lands within his/her jurisdiction.
- 5) Changes in wilderness study area boundaries.

Land Use Plan Decisions

The decision is hereby made to approve the attached Resource Management Plan for the Lakeview Resource Area of the Lakeview District, Bureau of Land Management (BLM). This plan was prepared under the regulations implementing the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 CFR Part 1600). An environmental impact statement was prepared for this RMP in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969. The RMP is identical to the preferred Alternative D described in the Proposed Lakeview Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement published in January 2003. Specific management decisions for public lands under the jurisdiction of the Lakeview Resource Area are presented in the section titled "Resource Management Plan" later in this document.

Land use plan decisions are identified in the attached RMP (summarized in Table R-1) and include:

- 1) Goals, objectives, standards, and guidelines that define desired outcomes or future conditions.
- 2) Land use allocations. This includes: a proposed withdrawal, and numerous special management area designations.
- 3) Visual resource management (VRM) classifications.
- 4) Land tenure.

- 5) Allowable uses and restrictions including:
 - a. specific off-highway vehicle (OHV) area and road closures,
 - b. mining restrictions, areas allotted to and excluded from livestock grazing,
 - c. areas open or closed to firewood cutting or other vegetative product removal, and
 - d. areas closed to commercial timber harvest or having no allowable sale quantity.

A 30-day protest period was provided on the land use plan decisions contained in the "Proposed RMP/Final EIS" in accordance with 43 CFR Part 1610.5-2. Fifteen protests were received and subsequently resolved. This ROD serves as the final decision for the land use plan decisions described above and becomes effective on the date this ROD is signed. No further administrative remedies are available at this time for these land use plan decisions (Table R-1).

Continuity of Previous Decisions

Within the attached RMP are a number of valid, existing decisions that were previously made in other land use plans, plan amendments, and project or activity level plans which will remain in effect and continue to be implemented. These do not represent new decisions that are subject to protest or appeal. Adminstrative relief opportunities were provided previously when those decisions were made. These decisions are summarized in Table R-2.

Implementation Decisions

It is the BLM's intent to implement, over time, a number of specific project level decisions described in the attached RMP, as funding and staff are available. These are called "implementation decisions" (as opposed to the land use planning decisions described above).

Some decisions in the RMP will require the preparation of detailed, project-level NEPA analyses prior to implementation (Table R-3). Public involvement opportunities, including further protest or appeal opportunities, may be provided at that time.

Other decisions have been addressed to a sufficient level of detail in the RMP/EIS process to be implemented over time without further NEPA analysis (Table R-4). An appeal opportunity for these decisions is

being provided at this time as described in the following section.

Appeal Procedures for Implementation Decisions

Any party adversely affected by an implementation decision (Table R-4) may appeal within 30 days of receipt of this decision in accordance with the provisions of 43 CFR Parts 4.4. The appeal must include a statement of reasons or file a separate statement of reasons within 30 days of filing the appeal. The appeal must state if a stay of the decision is being requested in accordance with 43 CFR 4.21 and must be filed with the Field Manager, at the following address:

Lakeview Resource Area Bureau of Land Management 1301 South G Street Lakeview, Oregon 97630

A copy of the appeal, statement of reasons, and all other supporting documents should be sent to the Regional Solicitor, Pacific Northwest Region, U.S. Department of the Interior, Lloyd 500 Building, Suite 607, 500 N.E. Multnomah Street, Portland, OR 97232. If the statement of reasons is filed separately it must be sent to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of Hearings and Appeals, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22203. It is suggested that any appeal be sent certified mail, return receipt requested.

Request for Stay

Should you wish to file a motion for stay pending the outcome of an appeal of these implementation decisions, you must show sufficient justification based on the following standards under 43 CFR 4.21:

- 1) The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied.
- 2) The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits.
- (3) The likelihood of immediate and irreparable harm if the stay is not granted.
- 4) Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

As noted above, the motion for stay must be filed in the office of the authorized officer.

Overview of the Alternatives

Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis

During the early stages of the planning process a number of alternatives were considered, but dropped from detailed analysis for a variety of reasons. These alternatives included:

- 1) No Management Alternative
- 2) Proposed High Desert Protection Act
- 3) Proposed Pronghorn and Alkali Lake ACECs
- 4) Wilderness Study Area Boundary Changes to Allow State Highway Re-alignment

A brief description of each alternative and the reason for dropping it from further analysis is contained in Chapter 3 of the "Proposed RMP/Final EIS" (USDI-BLM 2003).

Alternatives Analyzed in Detail

Five alternatives are analyzed in detail in the Proposed RMP/FEIS (USDI-BLM 2003). The overall theme determined the types of management actions that would be applied. Most of the alternatives, with the exception of Alternative E, were designed to meet the RMP management goals. However, they differed in how fast the management goal would be met, the degree to which it would be met, the priorities within the program, the emphasis placed on different management activities, whether actions are active or passive, and what trade-offs society would be willing to accept. Public input received throughout the planning process was considered in the development of alternatives. The alternatives varied in their ability to meet the management goals over the life of the plan (up to 20 years). Funding and staffing levels would affect rates of implementation, and projected implementation rates could vary by alternative, depending on the costs.

All alternatives included maintenance of existing facilities; however, the level of maintenance could vary by alternative and due to annual funding. All alternatives incorporated or complied with the management direction provided by the Warner sucker biological opinion agreements, the "Recovery Plan for the Threatened and Rare Fishes of the Warner Basin and Alkali Subbasin (USDI-USFWS 1998);" the "Standards for Land Health for Lands Administered by the Bureau of

Land Management in the States of Oregon and Washington" (USDI-BLM 1998); and the "Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review" (Wilderness IMP) (USDI-BLM 1995b). Most alternatives incorporated the "Greater Sage-Grouse and Sagebrush-Steppe Ecosystems Management Guidelines" (Sage-Grouse Planning Team 2000). Local Native American Tribes would be consulted during plan implementation for all actions that may affect their interests. Cultural resource surveys and sensitive species surveys would be conducted prior to any ground-disturbing activity or land disposal.

General Management Themes of the Alternatives

The following is a description of the general management theme for the five alternatives considered in detail.

Alternative A (No Action)

Alternative A continued present management and was considered the "no action" alternative. This alternative continued management under the three existing management framework plans (USDI-BLM 1983a, 1983b, 1983c), the "Lakeview Grazing Management Final EIS and Record of Decision" (USDI-BLM 1982a, 1982b), and the three management framework plan amendments (USDI-BLM 1989b, 1989c, 1996c, 1996d; USDI-USFWS and USDI-BLM 1998a, 1998b) and various existing activity plans. It included the management direction and protections provided by all currently approved activity plans such as allotment management plans or habitat management plans. Resource values or sensitive habitats received management emphasis at present levels. Emphasis was on maintaining existing conditions. There was no comprehensive plan for restoration of degraded systems and would occur on a case-by-case basis using either active or passive methods.

Alternative B (Commodity Production)

Alternative B emphasized commodity production and production of public goods and services (mining, grazing, commercial recreation, and commercial woodland products harvesting, etc.). Constraints on commodity production for sensitive resources was the least restrictive possible within the limits defined by law, regulation, and BLM policy, including compliance with the "Endangered Species Act," cultural resource protection laws, wetland preservation, etc. Potential impacts to sensitive resource values were mitigated on

a case-by-case basis. Emphasis was on maintaining existing conditions. Restoration actions that enhanced commodity production would utilize primarily active methods. Other restoration actions utilized passive methods.

Alternative C (Active Restoration)

Alternative C emphasized the active restoration of natural systems that are degraded and the maintenance of those that are functioning at a high level of condition. Commodity production was constrained to protect natural values and ecological systems. Constraints to protect sensitive resources, such as cultural resources, were the most restrictive. In some cases, commodity production could be excluded to protect sensitive resources. Both active and passive restoration methods were utilized to achieve management goals.

Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)

Alternative D is the BLM's preferred alternative. This alternative emphasizes a high level of natural resource protection and improvement in ecological conditions while providing a sustainable level of commodity production. This alternative balances the need to protect, restore, and enhance natural values, with the need to provide for the production of food, fiber, minerals, and services on the public lands. This would be done within the limits of the ecosystem's ability to provide these on a sustainable basis and within the constraints of various laws and regulations. Constraints to protect sensitive resources will be implemented, but they will be less restrictive than Alternative C. Restoration actions will utilize either active or passive methods to achieve management goals.

Alternative E (Passive Restoration)

This alternative excluded all permitted, discretionary uses of the public lands including livestock grazing, mineral sale or leasing, realty actions, recreation uses requiring permits, commercial rights-of-way, etc. The BLM would petition the Department of the Interior (DOI) to withdraw the entire planning area from locatable mineral entry. This alternative allowed no commodity production and included only those management actions necessary to maintain or enhance natural values and protect life and property. Management actions utilized primarily passive methods. Though some components of the alternative may not be possible to implement because of legal constraints, it was included for purposes of impact comparison.

Environmental Preferability of the Alternatives

Environmental preferability is judged using the criteria in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and subsequent guidance by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ, 1981). The CEQ has defined the environmentally preferable alternative as the alternative that will promote the national environmental policy as expressed in Section 101 of the NEPA. This section lists six broad policy goals for all Federal plans, programs, and policies:

- 1) Fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations;
- 2) Assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings;
- 3) Attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences;
- 4) Preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity and variety of individual choice;
- 5) Achieve a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities; and
- 6) Enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources.

Based on these criteria, identification of the most environmentally preferable alternative involves a balancing of current and potential resource uses with that of resource protection. Alternative A is about equal to Alternative B in terms of overall environmental preferability. The costs of implementation and impact on the local economy would maintain the status quo. Alternative B could be viewed the least environmentally preferable alternative, as it offers the most intensive livestock and other commodity uses of the area, and either negatively impacts other resource values the most or limits the rate of ecosystem recovery. This alternative would provide the most economic benefit to the economy in the short-term. Alternative D would be less environmentally preferable than Alternative C, but more preferable than Alternatives A or B. It offers similar, but somewhat less beneficial uses as Alternatives A and B, but provides less protection than Alternative C or E. This alternative would provide a

balance between sustainable economic benefits and resource protection. Alternative C would be more protective than Alternatives A, B, or D, but would allow fewer beneficial uses and cause a higher loss to the local economy than these three alternatives. Due to the use of active restoration, ecosystem recovery would be greatest of all the alternatives. Alternative E would reduce negative impacts from a variety of existing resource uses. However, due to the complete reliance on natural processes, it would do little to actively improve or restore resource conditions during the life of the plan. Though it would be the least expensive alternative to implement, it would result in the highest economic loss to the local economy.

Given the need to balance the six goals, the BLM finds that Alternative D best meets the definition of the environmentally preferred alternative.

Management Considerations

Rationale for the Decision

Based on the input received during the planning process, there was both support and opposition to many components of the proposed plan. No formal comments were received from Federal or state agencies, or tribal governments indicating the proposed plan was inconsistent with other existing plans or policies. Several comments were received on the proposed plan related to the conflict between the designation of new ACEC's and Lake County Ordinance 24. This is addressed in Chapter 1, pages 1-7 to 1-8 of the "Lakeview Proposed RMP/Final EIS" (USDI-BLM 2003).

The BLM is tasked with the job of multiple use management, as mandated under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and numerous other conflicting laws and regulations which govern the management of public lands. The proposed RMP (Alternative D) provides a balance between those reasonable measures necessary to protect the existing resource values and the continued public need to make beneficial use of the planning area. Therefore, the implementation of the Proposed RMP is the alternative best able to comply with all applicable laws, regulations, policy, and agency direction.

Mitigation Measures

In order to minimize impacts from implementation of the decisions contained in the RMP, the best management practices (BMP's) identified in Appendix D and stipulations and guidelines for mineral operations identified in Appendix N3 would be utilized where appropriate.

Plan Monitoring

The BLM planning regulations (43 CFR 1610.4-9) call for the monitoring of resource management plans on a continual basis with a formal evaluation done at periodic intervals. Implementation of the Lakeview RMP will be monitored over time. Plan evaluations will occur on about 5-year intervals. Management actions arising from activity plan decisions will be evaluated to ensure consistency with RMP objectives. This is described in more detail in the monitoring section of the attached RMP.

Public Involvement in the Planning Process

Scoping

Public involvement is an integral part of BLM's resource management planning process. The official start of the preparation of the Lakeview RMP/EIS was initiated with the publishing of a "Notice of Intent" to prepare an RMP/EIS in the Federal Register on June 21, 1999. This notice also included an invitation to the public to suggest issues to be addressed in the RMP and to provide comments concerning management of the public lands. In addition, approximately 500 public information or scoping packets, providing information about the planning process and inviting comments, were mailed to agencies, tribal governments, organizations, and individuals. News releases were sent to newspapers and radio stations in both Klamath Falls and Lakeview. Paid notices announcing the scoping period and meetings were placed in the legal notices sections of the two newspapers. The "Notice of Intent," news releases, and legal notices identified the beginning of the EIS scoping period and the location, date, and time of the public scoping meetings. The comment period extended from June 21 through July 31, 1999.

The public scoping meetings were held at the interagency office in Lakeview on July 13, 1999, and at the North Lake School on July 14, 1999. Seven people, including private citizens, mining company managers, representatives of two State agencies, and a newspaper reporter attended the meeting in Lakeview. No one

attended the meeting in north Lake County. Six written comments or letters were received at the meetings or during the comment period. These comments dealt primarily with designation of special management areas, preserving and protecting the naturalness of the resource area, and maintaining air quality in relation to prescribed burning. These comments were incorporated into the alternatives and the impact analysis of the Lakeview RMP/EIS.

Subbasin Review

Although technically not part of the public participation process, a subbasin review was conducted prior to completing the "Analysis of the Management Situation" (USDI-BLM 2000b). The subbasin review was a multi-agency collaborative effort to "step down" to the local level the findings and assessments of the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP) (see Appendix A of the Draft RMP/EIS (USDI-BLM 2001a)). In other words, did the findings from ICBEMP relate to the Lakeview RMP planning area? The subbasin review group determined that many of them did, and these were incorporated into the issues addressed in this plan.

Analysis of the Management Situation

The "Summary of the Analysis of the Management Situation" (USDI-BLM 2000f) was prepared after the subbasin review and mailed to approximately 500 agencies, tribal governments, organizations, and individuals in July 2000. It contained a description of the preliminary issues, alternatives, and planning criteria, as well as, the resource area profile, existing management situation, and management opportunities. The public was requested to comment on the information in the document, particularly the issues, alternatives, and planning criteria. The BLM received approximately 60 comment letters and emails. The majority of these comments dealt with the management opportunities identified for the Public Sunstone Collecting Area. Other comments dealt with potential management actions under the proposed alternatives. All comments were considered in developing the alternatives analyzed in the Draft Lakeview RMP/EIS (USDI-BLM 2001a).

Draft RMP/EIS

Approximately 1,300 copies of the Draft RMP/EIS (USDI-BLM 2001a) were mailed out to interested agencies, Tribes, individuals, and organizations. In addition, the document was made available on the Lakeview District's planning webpage (http://

www.or.blm.gov/Lakeview/Planning/planning.htm). Three public meetings were held during the 90-day public comment period on the draft. The BLM accepted comments for up to 60 days past the official close of the comment period. A total of 320 comment letters were received from Federal and state agencies, tribal governments, local governments, advisory groups, conservation or environmental organizations, commercial interests, and other interested public members. Approximately 150 letters were form letters or primarily "votes" for one alternative or another. About 90 of these form letters consisted of similar emails sent by members of the Oregon Natural Desert Association. About 76 letters contained what were considered substantive comments. In addition, a petition was submitted containing almost 500 signatures opposing proposed road and camping area closures in the northern part of Lake County. These were included in Volume IV of the "Proposed RMP/ Final EIS"(USDI-BLM 2003).

Proposed RMP/Final EIS

A 30-day protest period was provided on the "Proposed RMP/Final EIS" in accordance with 43 CFR Part 1610.5-2. A total of 15 protests and 3 comments letters were received. Nine of the protests were determined to represent valid protests. All valid protests were resolved by the BLM Director. All those who provided invalid protests or comment letters received a response from the Oregon/Washington BLM State Director.

Consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

In December 2000, the BLM initiated consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) regarding potential impacts of actions proposed in the Lakeview RMP to federally listed species or species proposed for listing. This is in conformance with the memorandum of agreement between the BLM and the USFWS dated August 30, 2000. A lead representative for the USFWS was designated and was sent Lakeview Draft RMP/EIS (USDI-BLM 2001a) for review and input to the process. The USFWS sent the BLM a list of species either federally-listed or proposed for listing that may occur in the planning area. Species that are known to occur in the planning area were addressed in the planning process. Consultation with the USFWS is documented in Chapter 5 of the proposed plan. A biological opinion or concurrence was requested on the "Proposed RMP/ Final EIS"(USDI-BLM 2003). The USFWS provided their biological opinion in October 2003.

Tribal Participation

Under Federal law and regulations, consultation with Native American Tribes who have an interest in the planning area is required. To accomplish this, district staff have met with or phoned Tribal groups regularly, and BLM managers have made repeated updates at Tribal Council meetings. Copies of the scooping packet, "Summary of the Analysis of the Management Situation" (USDI-BLM 2000f), "Draft RMP/EIS" (USDI-BLM 2001a), and "Proposed RMP/Final EIS" (USDI-BLM 2003) were sent to each of the Tribal groups for review and comment. Tribal consultation is documented further in Chapter 5 of the proposed plan.

RMP Implementation

Public involvement in plan implementation decisions is discussed in the "Implementation Decisions" section on page 2.

In addition, the Lakeview District may pilot the development of an implementation strategy or "business plan", that would allow further opportunities for public involvement in determining what portions of the Lakeview RMP should be highest priority for future implementation. The extent of public involvement in this effort has not been determined at this point in time. Further details may become available in the near future.

Managers' Recommendations

Having considered a full range of alternatives, associated impacts, and public input, I recommend adoption and implementation of the attached Lakeview Resource Management Plan.

Thomas E. Rasmussen

Date

Field Manager

Lakeview Resource Area

10/10/03

Steven A. Ellis District Manager

Lakeview District Office

Date

State Director Approval

I approve the attached Lakeview Resource Management Plan, as recommended. This document meets the requirements for a Record of Decision, as provided in 40 Code of Federal Regulations part 1505.2 and for a resource management plan, as described in 40 Code of Federal Regulations part 1610.0-5(k).

Elaine M. Brong Oregon State Director Date

Table R-1.—Summary of land use allocations

	Number	Acres	Miles	Map Number\Reference
Forest and Woodland Management Commercial forest lands Commercial forest lands with Allowable Sale Quantity Juniper Woodlands Retain existing juniper wood cutting areas Close existing juniper wood cutting area	v	15,331 0 215,052 37,625 950		V-3 V-3
Designate new juniper wood cutting areas Wildlife Management	4	18,956		V-3
Total forage allocation (AUMs) Tallgrass nesting area (Warner Wetlands ACEC)	22,829	400		Table 5, Appendix E1 SMA-10
Livestock Grazing Management Areas allotted to grazing Areas unalloted to grazing Areas excluded from grazing Total forage allocation (AUMs)	120	2,916,985 155,734 88,697		G-3 G-3 G-3 Appendix E1
Wild Horse Management Herd management areas Unoccupied herd areas Total forage allocation (AUMs) Paisley Desert Herd Management Area Beaty Butte Herd Management Area	2 1 1,800 3,000	710,440 31,859		SMA-4 SMA-4 Appendix E1
Special Management Areas Retain existing ACEC's Modify existing RNA Expand existing ACEC Designate new ACEC/RNA's Retain existing WSA's Recommend suitable WSR with Recreational designation	4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	165,935 8,883 18,049 131,116 486,873 1,311	4.4	SMA-4, 5, 7, 9, 10 SMA-9 SMA-7 SMA-4, 11-21 R-9, SMA-5, 7, 9, 13, 15, 16, 26-31 SMA-22
Cultural Resource Management Areas on National Register of Historic Places Native American traditional use areas	€ ∞	13,722 122,611		SMA-4
Fire Management Area of full wildfire suppression Area of modified wildfire suppression		350,131 2,839,829		FM-5 FM-5

	Number	Acres	Miles	Map or Table No.\Reference
Recreation Management Special Recreation Management Areas Extensive Recreation Management Areas	2	822,333 2,339,083		R-9
Wilderness therapy schools Total number of groups Maximum group size Annual maximum user days	3 9 plus leaders 12,800			
Off-Highway Vehicle Management Area open to OHV use Area closed to OHV use Area with limited OHV use Designated roads and trails Existing roads and trails		1,760,352 10,799 384,537 1,005,729		R-7 R-7, SMA-9A R-7, SMA-5, 7, 9A-31
Visual Resource Management Area in VRM class I Area in VRM class II Area in VRM class III Area in VRM class III		495,398 160,404 373,643 2,127,766		VRM-3 VRM-3 VRM-3 VRM-3
Energy and Mineral Management Areas open to salable mineral disposal Areas subject to salable mineral disposal restrictions Areas closed to salable mineral disposal Areas of salable surface occupancy avoidance ² Areas open to mineral leasing Areas subject to mineral leasing Areas closed to mineral leasing Areas open to mineral leasing Areas open to mineral location Areas subject to mineral location Areas subject to mineral location		1,135,560 902,170 524,930 676,150 1,112,222 1,609,042 496,819 1,105,659 2,104,648 28,503		M-8 M-8 M-8 M-8 M-9 M-9 M-9 M-10 M-10 M-10 M-10 M-10, SMA- 19
Land Tenure Management Zone 1 (retention) Zone 2 (suitable for exchange) Zone 3 (suitable for disposal by exchange or sale)		694,616 2,458,053 8,747³		L-5 L-5 L-5, Appendix O
Right-of-Way Management Right-of-way avoidance area Right-of-way exclusion area		828,332 487,192		L-8 L-8

	Number	Acres	Miles	Map or Table No.\Reference
Withdrawals				
Retain existing withdrawls	12	20,989		M-2
New withdrawl (recommendation)	1	4,600		SMA-19
Roads and Transportation Management				
Roads maintained as part of transportation plan			2,500	
Roads closed seasonally (12/1 to 3/31) ^{1/}			288	SMA-5, 24
Roads closed permanently			247	SMA-5, 7, 9-31
Roads maintained annually			100	

¹ Includes area seasonally closed from 12/1 to 3/31 in mule deer winter range, but limited to designated roads and trails the rest of the year.

² In confirmed sage-grouse breeding habitat.

³ Includes about 200 acres suitable for disposal to the tribes or BIA for reinternment purposes and about 200 acres suitable for disposal to Lake County or other civic organization for Fort Rock community expansion.

Table R-2.—Existing decisions carried forward and not subject to further administrative remedies

	Number	Acres	Map number	References
Forest and Woodlands Manage existing juniper wood cutting areas in accordance with existing plan.	5	37,710	V-3	USDI-BLM 1991c, 1991d
Noxious Weeds Continue to implement existing weed management plans for the Warner Basin and Abert Rim areas.	7			USDI-BLM 1995e, 1999g
Continue to implement an existing Integrated Noxious Weed Control Plan. Emphasize: • Detection of new invaders	1	3,200,000		USDI-BLM 1994d
 Inventory and control in hot spots 				
 Site restoration to desirable species 				
Expand control to new sites detected				
• Expand education and outreach efforts				
Wildlife Habitat Continue to implement existing wildlife habitat management plans for bighorn sheep habitat maintenance, restoration, and enhancement.	9			USDI-BLM 1980c, 1984a, 1984b, 1986a, 1987c, 1996d
Continue to improve his same winter habitat as identified in existing habitat management				

Continue to improve big game winter habitat, as identified in existing habitat management plans.

Special Status Animal Species

peregrine falcon in accordance with current recovery plans, biological opinions, and on-going consultation with the USFWS. Manage greater sage-grouse in accordance with the Interim Continue to manage Warner sucker, Foskett speckled dace, Hutton tui chub, bald eagle, and "Recovery Plan for the Threatened and Rare Native Fishes of the Warner Basin and Alkali Management Guidelines and future long-term conservation strategies. Implement the Subbasin"

Sage-Grouse Planning Team 2000, USDI-USFWS 1998, Appendix H1 of the Draft RMP/EIS

Livestock Grazing

Allotment-specific forage allocations Allotment-specific grazing systems

Wild Horses

Numbers will normally be reduced to the low end of the appropriate management level range. outside the herd management areas will be removed. The current memorandum of understanding with Hart Mountain National Antelope Refuge, whereby the BLM agrees to remove stray wild horses within the refuge boundaries, will be followed. If emergency situations arise, horses could be gathered for their survival. Horses straying Continue to gather wild horses, as necessary, in accordance with an existing gather plan,

USDI-BLM 1995c

Table 5, Appendix E

	Number	Acres	Man number	References
Continue to adjust wild horse population levels in accordance with monitoring studies, allotment evaluations, and rangeland health assessments, when needed. When monitoring data support a downward adjustment in the allocation of forage within herd management areas, proportionate decreases in wild horse appropriate management levels and authorized active use by livestock will be implemented through the adaptive management process.	Togram.		Togunu dava	
Special Management Areas Lake Abert ACEC An existing two-track road at the mouth of Juniper Creek, east of Highway 395, will be converted to a foot trail.			SMA-7	
Noxious weeds will continue to be managed according to direction in the Lake Abert plan amendment, the wilderness IMP, and the "Abert Rim Weed Management Area Plan".				USDI-BLM 1996b, 1995b, 1995e
Other management direction, as specified in the ACEC plan amendment, for air quality, fire, water resources, special status species, and cultural resources will continue to be implemented.				USDI-BLM 1996b
Abert Rim Addition to Lake Abert ACEC Noxious weeds will continue to be managed according to the "Abert Rim Weed Management Area Plan".				USDI-BLM 1995e
Warner Wetlands ACEC Continue to manage in accordance with the existing "Warner Wetlands Area of Critical Environmental Concern Management Plan" except as highlighted below.			SMA-10	USDI-BLM 1990b, 1990c, 1990d, 1990e, 1990f, 1990h,
Weed management in the ACEC will continut to be conducted according to the "Warner Basin Weed Management Area Plan".				1990i, 1990j USDI-BLM 1999g
Black Hills, Connley Hills, Fish Creek Rim, Foley Lake, Hawksie-Walksie, High Lakes, Juniper Mountain, Red Knoll, and Spanish Lakes ACEC/RNA's Livestock grazing will continue in these areas based on existing permit stipulations and approved allotment management plans. Any proposed future changes in grazing, including time and intensity of use, will be evaluated for impacts on the relevant and important values and will be permitted if the values will be maintained or enhanced. (If adverse impacts are identified in the future, existing livestock use will be adjusted using a variety of methods, including, but not limited to, fencing, reduction in livestock numbers, and changes in grazing season of use)."			G-3, SMA-4	
Noxious weeds, primarily medusahead, will continue to be treated within Red Knoll using integrated weed management techniques.				USDI-BLM 1994d
The existing habitat management plan for sensitive plants in the Black Hills area will continue.				USDI-BLM 1981b
Wild horse use in Hawksie-Walksie will continue to be managed in accordance with the existing herd management area plan and allotment management plan.				USDI-BLM 1977a, UDSI- USFWS 1998b

Table Rock ACEC Part of the ACEC (Allotment 0708) will allow livestock grazing use to continue based on existing permit stipulations. Recreation Special Recreation Management Areas	Acres Map number G-3	X ,
Warner Wetlands Special Recreation Management Area: Manage in accordance with the "Warner Wetlands Recreation Management Plan". This includes allowing hunting and motorized boating. Personal motorized watercraft (jetskis and waverunners) are not allowed.	K-9	USDI-BLM 1990b, 1990c, 1990d, 1990i

The following projects, will be considered (subject to NEPA review):

- Upgrade roads and construct facilities such as trailheads and boat ramps, as necessary for esource protection.
 - Close and rehabilitate additional roads, if necessary.
- Maintain present facilities, e.g., handicap accessible nature trails, view points, and interpretive sites.
- Develop and maintain foot and canoe trails and develop self-guiding interpretive literature in response to increased use.
 - Develop a joint USFWS and BLM campground along County Road 3-12.

	_	
	0	
•	ä	
,	z	
	z	
	ĭ	
_	9	
	ā	
	H	
•	-	
,	2	
	-	
•	2	
	ā	
	S	1
•	S	
	3	•
	z	
	ä	
ì	EFA	
ï	Ξ	
Ė	⋝	
	7	
	e	
,	ij	
	Ξ	
Ç	2	
•	<u>1</u>	
	ng ti	
•	ring ti	
•	urmg ti	
	danna ta	
	ea,	
•	v red	
	v red	,
	tely red	,
	ea,	,
	s tikely reg	•
	ons tikety reg	
	tions tikely red	
	tions tikely red	
	ons tikety reg	י
	e actions likely red	
	e actions likely red	
	'uture actions likely reg	
	e actions likely red	•
	'uture actions likely reg	•
	.—Future actions likely red	•
•	3.—Future actions likely red	֓֡֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֓֓֓֓֓֓֜֜֜֜֓֓֓֓֜֜֜֜֜֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֜֜֜֜֓֜֓
	K-3.—Future actions likely req	֓֡֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֓֓֓֓֓֓֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֓֓֓֓֓֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֓֓֓֓֓֓
•	K-3.—Future actions likely req	•
•	de K-3.—Future actions tikely red	
•	: K-3.—Future actions likely red	•

N1			
Number Tingtol-Guning	Number	Map	Kererences
Investors Grazing Improvement projects.			Table E3-1, Appendix E3
Forest and Woodlands Designate and/or design new juniper wood cutting areas or juniper treatments.		V-3	
Special Management Areas Warner Wetlands ACEC Include the meadow management area into the core wetland acquired lands unit of the ACEC. This area would be divided by fencing or natural barriers. The southern portion would utilize fire, mowing, and livestock grazing (authorized on a temporary nonrenewable grazing basis) to meet specific management objectives or as a pretreatment prior to planned prescribed fire to facilitate/enhance fuel breaks.		SMA-10	
High Lakes ACEC Remove the berm at the north end of Long Lake, if not needed.		SMA-16	
Cultural and Paleontological Resources Stabilize buildings and structures on the Shirk Ranch historical property located in the Guano Valley.		SMA-16	
Fire Implement emergency fire rehabilitation activities after wildland fire. Rest areas from livestock grazing for a minimum of two growing seasons. Other temporary use restrictions may be imposed, as warranted.			Appendix L
Recreation Picnic Area Develop a picnic area along Highway 31 (at milepost 34.5 south). Facilities could include picnic sites with tables, vault toilets, and kiosks for interpretation of resources and history.	1		
Sunstone Public Collection Area Develop a designated, primitive campground in the vicinity of the Sunstone Collection Area within the next 10 to 15 years. Facilities could include fire rings, campsite pads, and a potable water source. The area will be proposed as a fee site, if new facilities are constructed.	1	R-9	

	Number Map	Map	References
Energy and Minerals 3809 Regulations and the Sunstone Area Require a plan of operations for all mining activity that is not casual use,		M-4	USDI-BLM 2000i, 1998h, Appendix N3
regardless of the number of acres disturbed. Require a plan required for all exploration activities that disturb over 5 acres, bulk sampling which removes 1,000 tons or more of resumed ore for testing, or for any surface-disturbing operations greater than casual use in certain SMA's and lands/waters that contain federally proposed or listed threatened or endangered species or their			
proposed or designated critical habitat. The approval of plans of operations and mining claim use and occupancy would require future NEPA compliance. The BLM may receive several plans of operations in the Rabbit Basin commercial sunstone			
area annually. Standard mitigating measures can be found in Appendix N3. The "Lakeview Proposed RMP/FEIS" will serve as the NEPA analysis guiding future			
sunstone exploration and mining plans of operations for the Rabbit Basin sunstone area.			
Roads and Transportation Management New road construction to meet administrative or public access needs (miles).	20		Appendix D

7
ë
ā
0
2
0
t
:
8
:=
3
S
lecisions now subject to
ž
no
-
S
ï
.2
œ.
\mathbf{c}
ē
σ
2
=
<u>.</u>
3
3
6
ž
Ξ
2
d
implementation
.7
7
6
ゞ
γ
ᆣ
4
Ž
_
=
\mathbf{Q}
್ಡ
\vdash

Ó		Number Acres	sə.	Map or Table No.\Reference
	Wild Horses Change management in the Paisley and Beaty Butte Herd Management Areas in as follows:	2		
	Appropriate management level (AML) Paisley Desert Herd Management Area Beaty Butte Herd Management Area	60–150 100-250		
	Special Management Areas Lost Forest/Sand Dunes/Fossil Lake ACEC/RNA			
	Road 6151 through the Lost Forest RNA/ISA will be minimally upgraded. Primitive camping areas will be designated in the Lost Forest RNA and Sand Dunes WSA, with camping allowed only in these sites. Parking areas along main road 6151 through the Lost Forest will be provided for day use. Camping areas within the Sand Dunes WSA will be managed on a rotational basis. Adaptive management activities which will allow the continued use of each of these camping/staging areas while protecting the natural values of the area will be adopted as necessary to ensure their long-term use and protection.	∞		Map SMA-9
	Foley Lake ACEC/RNA The exclosure at Foley Lake will be enlarged to protect the Columbia cress from grazing.	1		
	Cultural and Paleontological Resources			
	Regularly patrol listed, eligible, or potential National Register of Historic Places known to contain large numbers of sites.			
	Recreation Special Recreation Management Areas			
	North Lake Special Recreation Management Area: The main road 6151 through the Lost Forest/Sand Dunes/Fossil Lake ACEC will be minimally upgraded to prevent continued resource damage. Camping will only be allowed in five designated primitive campsites located along the outer boundary of the Lost Forest RNA/ISA. The campsites will be small, with parking for one or two vehicles. Camping at the base of Sand Rock will be prohibited and the sites rehabilitated. A small pull-off along the road for parking will be delineated for day-use access to the Sand Rock area.	vo		Map SMA-9
	There will be three camping/staging areas allowed in the Sand Dunes WSA. Use of these three camping/staging areas will be managed on a rotational basis, i.e., two of the camping/staging areas will be open and available to use and the other area will be closed for an indeterminate amount of time (2–6 years) to allow natural rehabilitation to occur. Adaptive management will allow the continued use of each of these camping/staging areas and ensure the long-term use and protection of these areas.	60		Map SMA-9